

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 17-20 have been rejected. Appreciation is expressed for the indication of allowance of Claims 6 and 14-16 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-20 stand rejected due to informalities. Applicants have amended claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-20 to address the informalities raised by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2005/0013255 A1 issued to Knop et al. Claims 2 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knop in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,145 B1 issued to Pham et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Knop discloses an availability unit and monitor unit that monitor computers interfaced with a network to attempt to recover unavailable network interfaces.

Claim 2 recites, in part, “the configuration adjustment engine adjusts the configuration by setting the network communications component to communicate with a dynamic Internet address and send a re-configuration request to the remote deployment management station.”

Claim 10 recites, in part, “adjusting the network communication component to communicate with a dynamic address.”

Claim 20 recites, in part, “the configuration adjustment engine commands a selected NIC to communicate with a dynamic address if communication fails with each of the IP addresses.”

Knop and Pham cannot make obvious Claims 2, 10 and 20 because Knop and Pham fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 2, 10 and 20. For example, Knop and Pham fail to teach, disclose or suggest the use of both static and dynamic IP addresses in configuration of a network and recovery of a failed network communication component. Indeed, Pham teaches away from the combination suggested by the Examiner by stating “Since using a static IP assignment is incompatible with using DHCP...” (Col. 1, line 67 – Col. 2, line 1). Accordingly, Knop and Pham cannot make obvious Claims 2, 10 and 20 and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to these claims and issue a notice of allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees that may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on January 29, 2008.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020